



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
P.O. Box 1450  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

MEWBURN ELLIS  
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY  
YORK HOUSE  
23 KINGSWAY  
LONDON ENG WC2B6HP GB UNITED KINGDOM

**COPY MAILED**

NOV 23 2009

**OFFICE OF PETITIONS**

|                            |                          |
|----------------------------|--------------------------|
| In re Patent No. 7,569,602 | :                        |
| Issued: August 4, 2009     | :                        |
| Application No. 10/576,095 | : PATENT TERM ADJUSTMENT |
| Filed: April 14, 2006      | :                        |
| Dkt. No.: BJS-620-432      | :                        |

This is a decision on the "REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION OF PATENT TERM ADJUSTMENT PURSUANT TO 37 CFR 1.705(d)," filed September 11, 2009.

Patentees request correction of the patent term adjustment from 462 days to not less than 574 days. Patentees request this correction on the sole basis that the Office took in excess of three years to issue the above-referenced patent.

The application for patent term adjustment (PTA) under 37 CFR 1.705(d) is **DISMISSED**.

The above-identified application matured into U.S. Pat. No. 7,569,602 on August 4, 2009. The patent issued with a patent term adjustment of 462 days. Patentee argues that in view of Wyeth v. Dudas, 580 F. Supp. 2d 138, 88 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1538 (D.D.C. 2008), the patent is entitled to an adjustment of not less than 574 days (462 days pursuant to 35 USC 154(b)(1)(A) plus 112 days pursuant to 35 USC 154(b)(1)(B)).

Under 37 CFR 1.703(f), patentees are entitled to a period of patent term adjustment equal to the period of delays based on the grounds set forth in 37 CFR 1.702 reduced by the period of time equal to the period of time during which patentees failed to engage in reasonable efforts to conclude prosecution pursuant to 37 CFR 1.704. In other words, patentees are entitled to the period of Office delay reduced by the period of applicant delay.

The Office asserts that as of the issuance of the patent on August 4, 2009, the application was pending three years and 112 days after national stage commenced under 35 U.S.C. 371(b) or (f) in an international application (April 15, 2009 to August 4, 2009). The Office agrees that certain action was not taken within the specified time frame, and thus, the application was pending 14 months and 462 days prior to the mailing of the restriction requirement on September 18, 2008. At issue is whether patentees should accrue 112 days of patent term adjustment for the Office taking in excess of three years to issue the patent, as well as 462 days for Office failure to take a certain action within a specified time frame (or examination delay).

The Office contends that the period of 112 days of delay in issuance of the patent under 37 CFR 1.702(b) overlaps with the period of 462 days of examination delay under 37 CFR 1.702(a). Patentees' calculation of the period of overlap is inconsistent with the Office's interpretation of this provision. 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(A) limits the adjustment of patent term, as follows:

35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(A) limits the adjustment of patent term, as follows:

To the extent that the periods of delay attributable to grounds specified in paragraph (1) overlap, the period of any adjustment granted under this subsection shall not exceed the actual number of days the issuance of the patent was delayed.

As explained in *Explanation of 37 CFR 1.703(f)<sup>1</sup> and of the United States Patent and Trademark Office Interpretation of 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(A)*, 69 Fed. Reg. 34283 (June 21, 2004), the Office interprets 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(A) as permitting either patent term adjustment under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(A)(i)-(iv), or patent term adjustment under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B), but not as permitting patent term adjustment under both 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(A)(i)-(iv) and 154(b)(1)(B). Accordingly, the Office implements the overlap provision as follows:

If an application is entitled to an adjustment under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B), the entire period during which the application was pending (except for periods excluded under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B)(i)-(iii)), and not just the period beginning three years after the actual filing date of the application, is the period of delay under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B) in determining whether periods of delay overlap under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(A). Thus, any days of delay for Office issuance of the patent more than 3 years after the filing date of the application, which overlap with the days of patent term adjustment accorded prior to the issuance of the patent will not result in any additional patent term adjustment. See 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B), 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(A), and 37 CFR § 1.703(f). See *Changes to Implement Patent Term Adjustment Under Twenty Year Term; Final Rule*, 65 Fed. Reg. 54366 (Sept. 18, 2000). See also *Revision of Patent Term Extension and Patent Term Adjustment Provisions; Final Rule*, 69 Fed. Reg. 21704 (April 22, 2004), 1282 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office 100 (May 18, 2004).

Further, as stated in the *Explanation of 37 CFR 1.703(f) and of the United States Patent and Trademark Office Interpretation of 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(A)*, the Office has consistently taken the position that if an application is entitled to an adjustment under the three-year pendency provision of 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B), the entire period during which the application was pending before the Office (except for periods excluded under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B)(i)-(iii)), and not just the period beginning three years after the actual filing date of the application, is the relevant

---

<sup>1</sup> Likewise, 37 CFR 1.703(f) provides that:

To the extent that periods of delay attributable to the grounds specified in §1.702 overlap, the period of adjustment granted under this section shall not exceed the actual number of days the issuance of the patent was delayed.

period under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B) in determining whether periods of delay “overlap” under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(A).

This interpretation is consistent with the statute. Taken together the statute and rule provide that to the extent that periods of delay attributable to grounds specified in 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1) and in corresponding §1.702 overlap, the period of adjustment granted shall not exceed the actual number of days the issuance of the patent was delayed.

In this instance, the relevant period under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B) in determining whether periods of delay “overlap” under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(A) is the period during which the application was pending before the Office beginning on the date that national stage commenced under 35 U.S.C. 371(b) or (f) in an international application, April 14, 2006, and ending on the date that the patent issued, August 4, 2009.

Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(A) and 37 CFR 1.702(a)(1), the application was pending 14 months and 462 days prior to the issuance of the restriction requirement on September 18, 2008. Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B) and 37 CFR 1.702(b), the application was pending three years and 112 days prior to the issuance of the patent on August 4, 2009.

The 112 days of delay in issuance of the patent under 37 CFR 1.702(b) overlap with the 462 days of patent term adjustment under 37 CFR 1.702(a). Entry of both the 112 days and the 462 days is neither permitted nor warranted given that 462 days is the actual number of days issuance of the patent was delayed.

Accordingly, at issuance, having considered the 112 days of Office delay under the three-year pendency provision in conjunction with the 462 days of examination delay, the Office properly entered 462 days of patent term adjustment.

In view thereof, no adjustment to the patent term will be made.

No additional fees are due in connection with this matter.

The file does not indicate a change of address has been submitted, although the address given on the petition differs from the address of record. If appropriate, a change of address should be filed in accordance with MPEP 601.03. A courtesy copy of this decision is being mailed to the address given on the petition; however, the Office will mail all future correspondence solely to the address of record.

Telephone inquiries specific to this matter should be directed to the undersigned at (571) 272-3205.



Alesia M. Brown  
Petitions Attorney  
Office of Petitions

CC: B SADOFF  
Nixon & Vanderhye, P.C.  
901 North Glebe Road, 11th  
Arlington, VA 22203